■JS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The IS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	=>-			DEFENDANTS LOCKHEED	MARTIN CO	RPO	RATION	1	
ROBERT BRAD	EN					-		-	
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff Montgomery			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			Burlington		<u>.</u>
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, Telephone Number and Email Address)				NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE					
ames M. Duttera, Esquire				LAND INVOLVED.					
110 Marter Ave, Suite 10 Moorestown, NJ 08057	J5			Attorneys (If Known)					
356.854.4000									·
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X	C' in One Box Only)	III. C	ITIZENSHIP OF PI (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PAR		ice an "X" in On and One Box for		ntiff
U.S. Government Plaintiff	X3 Federal Question (U.S. Governme	nt Not a Party)	Citiz	PT cen of This State	1 D l Incorpora	ted <i>or</i> Princi ss In This St	ipal Place	PTF DEF	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	1 4 Diversity	uhin of Domina in James III)	Citi	zen of Another State		ted <i>and</i> Prin iness In Ano		0 5 0	5 .
	(indicate Chizen	ship of Parties in Item III)		zen or Subject of a O	3 G 3 Foreign N	lation		O 6 O	6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box	Only)				en e a constant a su	control for the same substract with		
ELECTION PAGE 1									
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJUI 362 Personal Injury		510 Agriculture 520 Other Food & Drug	422 Appeal 28 USC 423 Withdrawal	138		apportionment	
O 130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpracti	∞ ∪ ¢	525 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	19			
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Lisbility 320 Assault, Libel &	365 Personal Injury Product Liabilit	. la	of Property 21 USC 881 530 Liquor Laws	nagroza sagaret		3 450 Commer 3 460 Deportat		
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	368 Asbestos Persor	al 🗇 🤆	540 R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	c	J 470 Racketer	er Influenced ar	nd
☐ 151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Injury Product Liability		550 Airline Regs. 560 Occupational	330 Patent 3 840 Trademark	ء ا	Corrupt (1 480 Consum	Organizations er Credit	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPE		Safety/Health	D 640 Hackings	[2			
(Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product	370 Other Fraud	0	690 Other	PP CAT SES AT UNIONS		3 810 Selective		. 4
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle	371 Truth in Lendin 380 Other Personal		7 0 Fair Labor Standards	361 HIA (1395ff)	C C	Sou Securite פנס כ Exchang	es/Commodities te	y
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle	Property Damag	,c	Act	1 862 Black Lung (92)		3 875 Custome	er Challenge	
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	385 Property Damay Product Liabilit		720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	863 DIWC/DIWW (864 SSID Title XVI		12 USC 890 Other St	3410 latutory Actions	
195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	Injury			& Disclosure Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	lo	3 891 Agricult		•
SECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY.	C TENTONICE C			740 Railway Labor Act	SEPTED ERVIEWS			ic Stabilization	
210 Land Condemnation	441 Voting 442 Employment	510 Motions to Vac Sentence		790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	370 Taxes (U.S. Pla or Defendant)			nmental Matter: Allocation Act	
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment 443 Housing/	Habeas Corpus:	۲	Security Act	0 871 IRS-Third Pag			n of Informatio	
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations	530 General			26 USC 7609	l.	Act	60 D	
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	444 Welfare 445 Amer, w/Disabilitie	535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & C		日本 IMMIGRATION 単独体 462 Naturalization Application		լ	□ 900Appesid Under E	qual Access	MION
270 All Other Real Property	Employment	550 Civil Rights		463 Habeas Corpus -	1	l	to Justic	e e	
	446 Amer. w/Disabilitie	es - 🔼 555 Prison Conditio		Alien Detainee	İ	ľ	950 Constitu State St		
	Other 440 Other Civil Rights		٦	465 Other Immigration Actions			State St	nuces	
		Ī	- }						
52 1 Original ☐ 2 F	an "X" in One Box Only) temoved from	Remanded from Appellate Court		einstated or 5 Trans sopened spec	ier district - 1	Multidistric	t 🗆 7 🕯	Appeal to Dis Judge from Magistrate Judgment	trict
	Cite the U.S. Civi	Statute under which you	are filing	(Do not cite jurisdiction	al statutes unless div	ersity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	Brief description of See attac	of cause:							
VII. REQUESTED I	N D CHECK IF T	HIS IS A CLASS ACTIO	ON	DEMAND S	CHECK Y	ES only it	f demanded in	complaint:	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.			ss of \$150,000	JURY DE	EMAND:	2 Yes	O No	
VIII. RELATED CA	SE(S) (See instructions)	JUDGE			DOCKET NUM	BER			
Explanation:									
July 2, 2014									
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD									
			10	wa lut	1				
	<u> </u>		110	W- VW					

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

ROBERT BRADEN, : CIVIL ACTION NO.

Electronically Filed

Plaintiffs,

v.

LOCKHEED MARTIN : JURY TRIAL DEMANDED CORPORATION :

Defendant.

CIVIL COVER SHEET ATTACHMENT

- VI. a) Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"), as amended, by the Older Workers Benefits Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. § 621, et seq. and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination, as amended, N.J.S.A. §10:5-1, et seq. ("NJLAD")
- b) Plaintiff, Robert Braden, brings this action against his former employer, Defendant, Lockheed Martin Corporation. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, or a predecessor of Defendant, from 1984 until he was terminated because of his age in 2012.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

ROBERT BRADEN,

CIVIL ACTION NO.

Electronically Filed

Plaintiffs,

٧.

LOCKHEED MARTIN CORPORATION

Defendant.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Plaintiff, Robert Braden, brings this action against his former employer,

Defendant, Lockheed Martin Corporation. Plaintiff was employed by Defendant, or a

predecessor of Defendant, from 1984 until he was terminated because of his age in

2012. Plaintiff brings suit pursuant to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act

("ADEA"), as amended, by the Older Workers Benefits Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. § 621,

et seq. and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination, as amended, N.J.S.A. §10:5-1,

et seq. ("NJLAD"). Plaintiff seeks damages, including compensatory, liquidated,

punitive, and all other relief under federal laws prohibiting age discrimination in

employment and as this Court deems appropriate.

II. PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Robert Braden ("Plaintiff") is an individual, living in Penn Valley in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 2. Plaintiff was born in February, 1946 and is currently sixty-eight (68) years old.
- 3. Defendant, Lockheed Martin Corporation is a Maryland corporation, headquartered in Bethesda, Maryland.
- 4. Defendant is engaged in an industry affecting interstate commerce and regularly conducts business in the State of New Jersey.
- 5. At all times material to this action, Defendant was an employer within the meaning of the state and federal laws which form the basis of this action.
- 6. At all times material to this action, Defendant acted by and through authorized agents, servants, contractors and/or employees acting within the course and scope of their employment with Defendant or authorized by Defendant and in furtherance of Defendant's business.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. The causes of action set forth in this Complaint arise under the ADEA and NJLAD.
- 8. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over the ADEA claim (Count I) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331.
- 9. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the NJLAD claim (Count II) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
 - 10. This Court has diversity jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§1332, as the parties are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

- 11. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and (c) because events giving rise to the claims occurred within this district, and Defendant transacts business and is found in this district.
- 12. On or about January 9, 2013, Plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination ("Charge") with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"). Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the Charge (with minor redactions for purposes of electronic filing of confidential/identifying information).
- 13. More than sixty (60) days have elapsed since Plaintiff filed the Charge with the EEOC.
- 14. On or about May 13, 2014, in response to Plaintiff's request, the EEOC issed a Notice of Right to Sue on Plaintiff's request. Attached hereto, incorporated herein and marked as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the Notice of Right to Sue issued to Plaintiff (with minor redactions for purposes of electronic filing of confidential/identifying information).
- 15. Plaintiff has fully complied with all administrative prerequisites for the commencement of this action.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Plaintiff was hired by RCA in or about 1984. Through a series of mergers and acquisitions, Plaintiff became an employee of Defendant in or about March, 1995.
 - 17. During his employment, Plaintiff was disproportionately paid less than

younger employees performing substantially similar work, with similar or lesser skills and experience.

- 18. This pay disparity is a result of disparities in pay increases, caused by discriminatory performance evaluations.
- 19. Plaintiff has been present for discussions of performance reviews, where comments were made suggesting that it is preferable to give low evaluations (and therefore lower compensation) to older workers, because the older workers have nowhere else to go while younger employees might leave if they did not receive good raises.
- 20. At the time of his termination, Plaintiff worked in Defendant's Electronic Systems business area.
- 21. Within Electronic Systems, Plaintiff was part of the Mission Systems and Sensors business unit ("MS2").
- 22. At the time of his termination, Plaintiff was a Project Specialist, Sr. Staff ("PSSS").
- 23. At the time of his termination, Plaintiff was the oldest of six people (3 PSSS' and 3 Managers) reporting to Christopher Renna, Sr. Manager Equipment Engineering.
- 24. The other two PSSS' reporting to Mr. Renna were approximately 42 and38 years old. Plaintiff was 66 years old.
- 25. The three managers reporting to Mr. Renna were approximately 35, 42, and 52 years old.
 - 26. On or about July 10, 2012, Plaintiff was informed by Mr. Renna that he

(Plaintiff) had been selected for layoff, effective immediately.

- 27. Plaintiff was not given any specific reason as to why he was chosen for termination.
- 28. Plaintiff was given documents that claimed, "Managers assessed the current needs of the business and the abilities of employees to meet those needs in each skill category, in accordance with established policy." In other words, the decision was made based on the subjective opinions of managers.
- 29. Defendant did not utilize any objective measurements in determining which employees to terminate as part of the layoffs.
- 30. There were no processes or procedures in place to prevent age discrimination in connection with the layoffs.
- 31. Plaintiff was the only one of the six employees reporting to Mr. Renna who were selected for termination.
- 32. A significantly younger individual reporting to Mr. Renna, Kimberly Tighe (38), had just been made a PSSS, but she was retained over Plaintiff.
- 33. Despite the layoffs of a large number of employees, Defendant continued to recruit and hire younger individuals for positions for which Plaintiff was qualified.
- 34. Five workers with Plaintiff's title (Project Specialist, Sr. Staff) out of approximately 110 were terminated as part of the layoffs. All five were over the age of 50.
- 35. Upon information, approximately twelve (12) people from two levels below Mr. Renna were terminated. Eight were over the age of fifty.
 - 36. Plaintiff's performance had been excellent and did not warrant termination.

37. Plaintiff's age (then 66) was a motivating and determinative factor in his termination.

COUNT I ADEA

- 38. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 37 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.
- 39. Defendant, by the discriminatory acts set forth herein, have violated the ADEA.
- 40 Defendant's violations were intentional and willful under the circumstances and warrant the imposition of liquidated damages.
- 41. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violation of the ADEA, Plaintiff has sustained the injuries, damages and losses set forth herein.
- 42. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and unlawful acts unless and until the Court grants the relief requested herein.

COUNT II NJLAD

- 43. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 42 as if set forth herein in their entirety.
 - 44. Defendant violated the LAD by discriminating against Plaintiff.
- 45. Members of upper management of Defendant had actual participation in, or willful indifference to, Defendant's wrongful conduct described herein.
- 46. Defendant's wrongful actions were especially egregious, warranting the imposition of punitive damages.

- 47. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's violations of the LAD, Plaintiff has suffered the damages and losses set forth herein.
- 48. Plaintiff is now suffering and will continue to suffer irreparable injury as a result of Defendant's discriminatory and unlawful acts unless and until this Court grants the relief requested herein.

RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff, Robert Braden, and against Defendant, Lockheed Martin Corporation:

- a. declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be a violation of the ADEA;
- b. declaring the acts and practices complained of herein to be a violation of the LAD:
 - c. enjoining and restraining permanently the violations alleged herein;
- d. awarding damages to Plaintiff for the past and future economic losses that he has suffered;
- e. awarding compensatory damages to Plaintiff for past and future emotional upset, mental anguish, humiliation, loss of life's pleasures, and pain and suffering;
 - f. awarding liquidated damages to Plaintiff pursuant to the ADEA;
 - g. awarding Plaintiff punitive damages pursuant to the LAD;
- h. awarding Plaintiff the costs of this action, together with reasonable attorney's fees;
- i. awarding Plaintiff such other damages as are appropriate under the
 ADEA, the LAD and federal and state law; and

j. granting such other and further relief as this Court deems appropriate.

CONSOLE LAW OFFICES LLC

Dated: July 2, 2014 BY: Isl James M. Duttera

James M. Duttera (856) 854-4000

Attorney for Plaintiff, Robert Braden

EXHIBIT A

•							
CHARGE OF DISCRIMING This form is affected by the Privacy Act of 1974		GENCY FEPA EEOC	CHARGE NUMBER 530-2013-01148				
before consolidating this form.				330-2813-01178			
STATE OR LOCAL AGEN	CY:						
NAME (Indicate Mr., Ms., Mrs.) Robert Braden	HOME TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code)						
	TY, STATE AND ZI nn Valley, PA 19072	DATE OF BIRTH					
NAMED IS THE EMPLOYER, LABOR OF STATE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT WHO	RGANIZATION, E DISCRIMINATED A	MPLOYME GAINST M	NT AGE IE (If mot	ENCY, APPRENTICESHIP, COMMITTEE, re than one than list below)			
NAME NUMBER OF EMPLOYER MEMBERS >15			YEES, TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)				
STREET ADDRESS	A 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			COUNTY			
199 Borton Landing Road Corporate Headquarters	Corporate Headquarters			Burlington			
6801 Rockledge Drive	Bethesda, MD 20	0818					
CAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION (Check appropriate box(es)) Race							
THE PARTICULARS ARE: A. Relevant Work History I have been employed by Respondent, Lockheed Martin Corporation, or a predecessor of Respondent since 1984. At the time of my termination, I worked in Respondent's Electronic Systems business area, headed by Marilyn Hewson. Within Electronic Systems, I was part of the Mission Systems and Sensors business unit ("MS2"). At the time of my termination, I was sixty-six (66) years old. I was a Project Specialist, Sr. Staff ("PSSS"). I was the oldest of six people (3 PSSS' and 3 Managers) reporting to Christopher Renna, Sr. Manager Equipment Engineering (45*). The other two PSSS' reporting to Mr. Renna were approximately 42 and 38 years old. The three managers reporting to him were approximately 35, 42, and 52 years old.							
* All ages herein are approximate.							
I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or telephone number and cooperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in accordance with their procedures			er				
I declare under penalty or perjury that the foregoing is tru	ie and correct.						
Date: 1/9/2013 Charging Purty (Signature)	ha	SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE (Day Month, and year)					
Date: 1/9/2013 Charging Purty (Signature)		(Day Month,	and year)	- PH			

Braden v. Lockheed Martin Corporation EEOC Charge of Discrimination Page 2 of 3

2. Statement of Harm

During my employment, I was consistently underpaid because of my age, including as a result of age-biased annual evaluations.

On or about July 10, 2012, I was informed by Mr. Renna that I had been selected for layoff, effective immediately. According to paperwork that I was given, I was one of 308 employees within MS2 notified of termination. I was the only person reporting to Mr. Renna who was terminated.

B. Respondent's Alleged Reasons

I have not been given any specific reason as to why I was chosen for termination. However, I was given documents that claimed, "Managers assessed the current needs of the business and the abilities of employees to meet those needs in each skill category, in accordance with established policy." The specifics of this decision, and whether it was any more objective than each manager's preference, is not explained.

C. Rationale/Basis for Allegations of Discrimination and Statutes Covered

I allege that Respondent has discriminated against me based on my age in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 621, et seq. ("ADEA") and, the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination, as amended, N.J.S.A. 10:5-1, et seq. ("NJLAD").

Evidence of discrimination includes, but is not limited to (in addition to what is set forth herein):

- 1. Upon information and belief, older employees are given below average performance evaluation scores in significantly greater numbers than younger employees, and given above average performance evaluation scores in significantly lower numbers than younger employees. Also, I have been present for discussions of performance reviews, were comments were made suggesting that it is preferable to give low evaluations (and therefore lower compensation) to older workers, because the older workers have nowhere else to go while younger employees might leave if they did not receive good raises.
- 2. I was the oldest by far of the six employees reporting to Mr. Renna, and the only one terminated.
- 3. A significantly younger individual reporting to Mr. Renna, Kimberly Tighe (38), had just been made a PSSS, but she was retained over me.
- 4. Upon information and belief, approximately twelve employees were laid off from positions two levels below Mr. Renna (i.e. workers who reported to the 3 managers reporting to him). At least eight of them were over the age of fifty years old.

Braden v. Lockheed Martin Corporation EEOC Charge of Discrimination Page 3 of 3

- 5. According to the OWBPA data given to me, five workers with my title (Project Specialist, Sr. Staff) were terminated. All five were over the age of 50.
- 6. My performance had been excellent and did not warrant termination.
- 7. Respondent's vaguely described reason for my termination is a pretext for age discrimination.

EXHIBIT B

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

EEOC Form 161-B (10/96)

		NOTICE OF	RIGHT TO SUE (IS	SUED ON REQUEST)			
	То	: Robert Braden Penn Valley, PA 19072	Froi	n: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Philadelphia District Office 801 Market Street, PH Suite 1300 Philadelphia, PA 19107-3127			
1	1	On behalf of person(s) aggrieved whose ic CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR § 1601.7(a))	lentity is				
Charge	No.		EEOC Representative	Telephone No.			
530-201	13-01148_		Legal Unit	(215) 440-2828			
Notic	CE TO THE	ional information attached to this for PERSON AGGRIEVED:					
under 1	Title VII ar must be fil	d/or the ADA based on the above-	numbered charge. It has been been discounted in the second section of the second secon	clities Act (ADA): This is your Notice of Right to Sue, issued been issued at your request. Your lawsuit under Title VII or the ceipt of this Notice. Otherwise, your right to sue based on this be different.)			
[]	More than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge.					
[]	Less than 180 days have passed since the filing of this charge, but I have determined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will be able to complete its administrative processing within 180 days from the filing of the charge.					
Į.]	The EEOC is terminating its processing of this charge.					
[]	The EEOC will continue to process this charge.					
Age D 90 day case:	viscriminat vs after you	tion in Employment Act (ADEA): receive notice that we have compl	You may sue under the leted action on the charge.	ADEA at any time from 60 days after the charge was filed until In this regard, the paragraph marked below applies to your			
[3	X]	The EEOC is closing your case. WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receive lost.	Therefore, your lawsuit useipt of this Notice. Other	nder the ADEA must be filed in federal or state court wise, your right to sue based on the above-numbered charge will			
[]	The EEOC is continuing its hand you may file suit in federal or sta	lling of your ADEA case. te court under the ADEA	However, if 60 days have passed since the filing of your charge, at this time.			
in fade	aral or state	EPA): You already have the right court within 2 years (3 years for what occurred more than 2 years (willful violations) of the al	ng an EEOC charge is not required.) EPA suits must be brought leged EPA underpayment. This means that backpay due for uit may not be collectible.			
		ased on this charge, please send a c					
			On behalf of the Cor	nmission \(\lambda \l			

Spencer H. Lewis, Jr. District Director

(Date Mailed)

cc: LOCKHEED MARTIN CORPORATION
James M Duttera, Esq. (for Charging Party)
Brittni A Pitts Esq. (for Respondent)

Enclosure(s)